

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 258

FL 018 511

AUTHOR Paine, Ruth
TITLE The Past, Present, and Future of the Consortium and Foreign Language Instruction.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 15p.; In: Dimension: Languages 77. Proceedings of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching (Orlando, FL, October 1977).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; Educational History; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Long Range Planning; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs

ABSTRACT

The proportion of active foreign language teachers working in cooperative or collaborative efforts is very small. Foreign languages have lagged behind other disciplines in this area. Consortia, or groups of postsecondary institutions agreeing to work together toward specific, long-range goals, date back to medieval times, but few have emerged over the course of educational history. Only since the 1960s has interinstitutional cooperation been widely undertaken, often for institutional survival. The consortium requires a different internal and external structure from that of member institutions, with loss of institutional sovereignty and conflict in member interests an early challenge. Advantages gained by the pooling of talents, resources, and facilities are substantial and can be applied in many administrative and academic areas. Encouragement of consortial grouping is growing around the country. In some consortia, languages are an important part of the group's activities. Individual institutions' strengths are developed and linked to provide full language services to all students; institutions coordinate efforts to attract funding for more advanced teaching technology; others use their combined forces to keep language and area studies alive when they are threatened. Consortia can help the language profession exploit the available resources and end the unproductive autonomous mindset. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED318258

THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF THE CONSORTIUM AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

by

Ruth Paine
Saint Augustine College

A short publication issued by the Academy for Educational Development has, as an attractive cover lure, the following advantages to be found in reading the bulletin and taking its advice: "...improve management, strengthen recruitment, fill empty seats, share expensive facilities and equipment, make more effective use of faculty talents, foster innovation, create new programs from existing resources, demonstrate cash savings..." Can it be true? Can such a tool be available at last? Where can we find it? How can so many answers so easily be found to these perennially-plaguing problems in institutions of higher learning which preoccupy the concerns of department heads, deans, chancellors, and legislators. Of course, wise as we all are to the "promises, promises" of advertising we may be skeptical, but we will not fail to be impressed by the evident simplicity of the solution proposed: that of cooperative arrangements among institutions of higher learning, and in particular that of the consortium.

Before we even begin to talk about consortia and their many near-relations, I'd be interested to know if any, or many, of those in this audience have had any working experience in a consortium? Or, among the rest of those present, have you had any peripheral contact with a proposal or suggestion which was predicated on participation by your department in a consortium arrangement of any kind?

It may come as a surprise to note that the percentage of active teaching members in the field of foreign languages, working in cooperative or collaborative efforts, is very small. Research done in preparation for this paper bears out this findings: in the slow but steady movement toward ever-increasing cooperation among institutions, both public and private, the language disciplines are in the rear guard. Is there a discrepancy, then, in such a discovery and the rationally-presented desirable objectives said to be offered by the creation and maintenance of consortium arrangements? I think there is, and I suggest that we examine just where our profession stands in relation to cooperative efforts, and where it may be going. All of the literature (and that it is rapidly and importantly increasing corpus of work) cites the growth of cooperative efforts as a specific response to the very questions and problems which have burdened the field of foreign language instruction, among others, through the last decade of discouraging declines and shifts in academic and social values with regard to the form and substance of higher education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gratzman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

But, first, what are we talking about when we use the word consortium? The word isn't a new one, to be sure, but its application to the field of education is relatively new, in view of its former significance as a term found in business and finance. Its very adoption by the teaching professions is a reflection of where institutional emphases currently lie. There is an accepted definition of just what an educational consortium is, and I ask you to keep in mind that this will become a theme with many variations:

It is a voluntary, formal organization, with three or more member institutions, which has multi-academic programs. It is administered by at least one full-time professional director and has a required annual contribution of funds or other tangible evidence of long-term commitment from the member institutions.²

May I call to your attention, first of all, that there exist at the present time over 120 formal consortia, meeting the above criteria, and which are all members of the Council on Interinstitutional Leadership, headed by Dr. Lewis D. Patterson. For those of you who may wish to look further into the possibilities of collaborative undertakings, I can assure you that Dr. Patterson is universally recognized as the most knowledgeable and central source of information on such arrangements. The 120-plus cooperative groups are listed and described in the annually-updated Consortium Directory, available from the Council on Interinstitutional Leadership.

We are thinking, then, primarily of a group of postsecondary institutions which have agreed to work together toward specific, long-range goals. They are willing to confirm that intention by backing up their resolve with the important contributions of time and hard cash. As we know too well in the classroom, a definition often seems to delimit the reality of a subject because exceptions and modifications appear at once which must be taken into account. This is the case with consortia, where the formal criteria indicated earlier are not always entirely present in instances of effective cooperation.

It is probably true that the earliest examples of instructional cooperation could be said to be the medieval "clusters" of colleges such as those at Oxford or the University of Paris. But it is a long step to the next formal association of teaching bodies in 1925, when the Claremont Colleges system in California was created. This group associated for academic purposes, committed itself to pooling and sharing certain significant resources, and to establishing differentiated missions among its members. This retention of individual identity will remain a critical factor in the development of the cooperative movement. In 1929, the Atlanta University Center was founded by Atlanta University, Morehouse and Spelman Colleges. But it isn't until the 1960s that the momentum toward increasing cooperation could truly be called a movement. This period of economic retrenchment particularly forced many academic leaders to re-think their own roles and those of

their institutions. "There seems to be an inherent human quality that says COOPERATE when the going gets tough," says Donald A. Johnson, Director of the successful Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center.³

Johnson reminds us, too, that the consortium concept can help small schools survive. He sees it as "one of the most prudent ways for a small school to provide breadth of opportunity to its students and still retain the small, private, liberal arts identity." It is in this light that the consortium movement can be seen as a conservator of institutional integrity. It is, as David Mathews, former Secretary of HEW, has indicated, a counterweight to the "public utility" approach toward higher education of which we are all increasingly aware. Some have also seen in this voluntary effort a means of surviving the crisis of exploding technologies information, and changing concepts of educational aspirations and objectives. Not to be overlooked is the direct, and never subtle role of governmental influence, whether on the state or federal level, toward bringing all institutions (especially those supported by tax dollars) into the fold of productivity and accountability. It can also be said that by choosing the route of voluntary cooperative effort, whether in private or state institutions, the humanistic and conferential values can be allowed to prevail over those of regulation and computerization. More than one educational leader, despite the "green carrot" of government funding, sees no influence more likely to subvert vitality and excellence than the compulsory coordination of higher education within the state.

It was in 1962 that a conference on college and university interinstitutional cooperation was held at Princeton, with representatives of the few existing consortia of that time, and with the active support of the Ford Foundation and the Corning Glass Works Foundation.

The addition of substantial Federal support by enactment of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 gave strong impetus to the creation of consortia among "developing institutions." These are seen to be those colleges "struggling for survival," and "isolated from the main currents of academic life." Although the description of a consortium stated earlier called for voluntary formation of such groups, it must be noted that state, county, and regional government units are increasingly mandating cooperation among their component elements, as management techniques are employed to justify appropriations, establish budgets, and assure, to the horror of scholars and researchers, that maximum "productivity" is guaranteed for tax dollars allocated to education.

It is obvious, I think, that a consortium requires a different internal and external structure from that of the member institutions. Decisions must be made, not on the basis of benefit to the individual member organization, but on that of the goals and objectives established for the newly-created body. Whether the consortium is a

multi-campus college governed by a president or a chancellor, or a voluntary combination of very dissimilar institutions, public or private, one of the first obstacles to successful consortium organization and functioning is the conflict among the autonomous units prior to entering.

This loss of sovereignty is a threatening development to participating institutions which are reluctant to relinquish their peculiar strengths and styles and become subordinate to an "umbrella" organization. The hesitancy to abandon the individual gain for the greater good is similar to that seen in political entities such as the United Nations or the Common Market, or even in social schemes, where some abdication of individual advantage is essential to the successful achievement of team or group goals. The task of guiding deans, business officers, librarians, department chairmen and others toward initiatives in group planning with long-range objectives reaching beyond the institution's four walls requires new leadership techniques and consistent conviction of the values and rewards to be attained. In view of the profound changes in relations among state and private institutions in many parts of the country, the Report of the Task Force on Post-secondary Education of Denver, Colorado, states: "The day of the completely autonomous institution, if it ever existed, is over."⁴

The advantages to be gained by the pooling of talents, resources, and facilities are indeed those presented on the cover of the booklet, Putting Cooperation to Work, with which I opened these remarks. The consortium has proven to be an answer to individual institutional problems of enrollment (too large or too small), registration, economic justification, curriculum offerings, broadening faculty exposure, and embarkation on innovative programs which might not fit comfortably into the traditional mission or style of a participating institution on its own.

The American Association of Higher Education estimates that there are probably 10,000 forms of linkage systems among the nation's 2600-plus colleges and universities, both statutory and voluntary, some with heterogeneous and other with homogeneous membership. Some are based largely on single-purpose, some on multi-purpose objectives. Some are based on geographic proximity; others have members as far apart as the East and West Coasts. There is, unfortunately, a mercurial quality to many cooperative arrangements, probably due to the relative inexperience of most institutions in coordinated activities with institutions beyond their own confines. Yet there seems to be little doubt that cooperation is an idea whose time has come, and creating techniques and formats which will meet institutional needs and respond to social and cultural pressures will doubtless be many years in perfecting.

Every multi-lateral agreement to cooperate is not a consortium since there are, for example, out-reach programs whereby a strongly-established college or university lends to smaller institutions its greater resources and experiences in

services or teaching. I might cite, as an example, the leadership of Duke University in a consortium known as SASASAAS, through which a group of smaller colleges is brought together to study on a transcultural basis selected thematic topics from which modules are prepared to be used in undergraduate teaching. There are single-track efforts, too, through which my own college, Saint Augustine's, in Raleigh, North Carolina, funded by the Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs of the U. S. Department of State, discharges a single obligation--a series of seminars for international students under the sponsorship of the Fulbright-Hays Act.

It is hard to comprehend just how used we have become to cooperation, when we think of bilateral agreements, State systems, professional associations like SCOLT, interstate compacts, associations of colleges and universities, accrediting agencies and commissions both regional and national. As patterns of cooperation evolve, hard and fast categorization becomes increasingly difficult. Examples are proliferating of voluntary consortia working closely with State coordinating agencies. One example is seen in the New Hampshire College and University Council, which, with a major grant from the Kellogg Foundation, is working with the State Postsecondary Education Commission on the whole matter of statewide planning. New and complex multi-institutional organizations have recently come into being which also defy traditional voluntary-statutory distinctions. States like Virginia, New York, Pennsylvania have placed great emphasis on regionalization and, within that framework, on the willingness of private institutions to function cooperatively.

This encouragement of consortial regional grouping is slowly appearing in growing numbers of states, but Illinois remains the prototype whereby public and private institutions, in combination or on their own, may submit proposals to the Board of Higher Education to be competitively considered for State. Yet of all the programs being so funded through that State's master-plan, information recently received indicates that only one is concerned with languages, and that in a special way which will be discussed shortly. This combination of public and private sectors has had an encouraging consequence in the fact that Illinois has more institutions in the 120-plus consortia than any other state.

I was delighted to see that the theme of this conference is "The New South: An Expanding Center of Language Study," since here lies an important potential interest in language instruction. If we think of the area covered by SCOLT, and take into account the Southeastern Region, we find that this section is reasonably well represented among the major consortia. Indeed, the CIL Directory shows that there are 21 important consortial groupings in the Southeast. I have been in touch with all of them, in an effort to determine what role foreign language instruction is playing in their activities. It can be reported that in only a few of them is the discipline represented by some interesting and prospering undertakings. In some cases there was no response, an indication perhaps of the degree of activity of the consortium itself. But, among those describing their work and programs only three, the Atlanta University Center, the Greensboro Consortium, and the New Orleans

Consortium, felt that languages were an important reason for the consortium's organization. The Southeastern area, too, does not share the wider view of the role of international studies, as are often concomitant with language programs in other regions. Perhaps these are areas which might be considered for further investigation, in an effort to understand why so many of the major "international" programs in advanced studies appear most frequently outside the Southeastern states.

Examination of current materials on cooperation shows that it is in responding, not only to "management" pressures, but in accommodating the new constituencies and developing disciplines, that the greatest thrusts toward innovative and cooperative efforts have been made. A survey of consortia, in general, shows them to be finding their strongest growth among such areas as continuing education, urban and social studies, community and health affairs, libraries and cultural interests. Other curriculum developments have been found in entirely new fields, such as ethnic heritage studies, inner-city teacher experimental corps, black and Chicano studies, environmental studies, land use, energy, economic and human resources. Cincinnati is the only city offering on a consortium basis the current "course by newspaper."⁵ There are even consortia, like a very large one called GT 10/70 (Group Ten Community Colleges for the Seventies) whose members are spread from California to Newark, New Jersey, and whose offices are maintained in Washington, D. C. Its function is to keep members apprised of what is possible in the ways of programming and to provide a national perspective on local college affairs.

There is no question that the development of curriculum materials themselves, in the form of joint degrees, joint materials preparation, and joint courses, is as yet in its infancy. The emphases found in analyzing the purposes of consortia already in existence are those placed on administrative improvements and advantages. Cost factors constantly arise as these areas are considered and are especially obvious in the sharing of TV, library, research, and other information networks. But consortia seek to take advantage of group power even in credit union, insurances of various kinds, personnel, and workshop-conference techniques.

Lawrence Belle, in his article, "Consortia Should Not Be Confused with Rose Gardens," is well aware that due to the sense of uniqueness or autonomy felt by individual institutions, they have not yet readily lent themselves to amalgamation, conglomeration, or indeed voluntary cooperation.⁶ In spite of all the areas outlined above, where administrative and fiscal opportunities have been seen and realized in consortia, "rarely when it comes to the bread-and-butter, day-to-day business, that is of French, Spanish, or English classes meeting on MWF at 10 and where, have consortia made much of an impact." Yet this is exactly the area where our field needs to do its work, to achieve some of the goals cited at the beginning of this talk. This conference, with its sense of potential, can inspire

and open up the world of foreign language study from the dreary prospect of seeing elementary courses remain merely stable, eventually producing fewer specialists or majors as time goes on.

In his article, "Two-Year Colleges Reach Out," Richard Witter underscores the rapidly growing movement between private colleges, mostly of a liberal arts nature and surrounding two-year institutions, the junior and community colleges.⁷ In the State of North Carolina, there are being added the "technical institutes" where, it should not be overlooked, constituents cry out for "humanistic" educational materials in addition to the valuable vocational offerings which are the primary "product" of these institutes.

To cite some specific examples, however, where languages are an important part of a consortium's activities, let us start with a recent and very encouraging one. I'm speaking of the New Orleans Consortium, under the direction of Dr. Mary H. Ellis.⁸ This consortium is the recipient of one of twenty-two "mini-grants" made by the Kellogg Foundation through the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (itself a distinguished consortium). Although intended originally as one of four large projects in faculty and curriculum development, the New Orleans Consortium grant was the only award to deal with foreign languages.

The specifics are these: due to declining enrollment in the languages (a sad fact again confirmed by recent correspondence with the Modern Languages Association in New York) it was agreed that it was economically unfeasible to continue teaching all languages at all institutions in the consortium. Therefore, the plan is to utilize the existing strengths at each of the institutions to provide full language services to all students. Beginning courses will continue to be offered at all campuses since enrollments are strong. However, upper level courses will be specialized with Xavier as the Spanish Center, Dominican College as the French Center, etc. The proposition for such an arrangement has been some time in the fulfillment, however, in view of the internal opposition encountered when the idea was presented. Dr. Ellis says, "We are very much excited about this project in languages: we feel that it will not only maintain but increase quality of offerings, provide a wider variety of offerings, and eventually cost less money. Certainly it guarantees that foreign language offerings will continue at our institutions."

Naturally that is the basic interest which we all want to safeguard and insure, that advanced and consistent language studies continue even if it means re-thinking the roles played by individual departments and institutions.

A similar model has been found to be effective in the Greensboro Consortium, made up of Greensboro College, Guilford College, and Bennett College in North Carolina.⁹ A language discipline as a specialty or major exists on each of the campuses while the beginning courses are available still at all of the colleges.

Since upper level courses were averaging five students per class, obviously in cost-conscious times like these, the inevitable choice had to be made, and was implemented to the general satisfaction of this effective and successful consortium.

Another aspect of how consortia contributed to the enrichment of language arts programs is that described by Dan H. Martin, President of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. His group was an early leader in using its inter-institutional format to attract substantial funds to introduce the technology of language teaching, that is, the development of language laboratories and assistance to foreign language instructors in learning how to use these facilities. To this day, its central office in Chicago currently administers twelve cooperative off-campus programs. Under consortium auspices, and in cooperation with another large consortium, the Great Lakes Colleges Association, undergraduates may choose East Asian studies at Waseda University in Tokyo; Indian studies at the University of Poona; Latin American Studies or social and natural science field research in Costa Rica; an arts survey in London and an intensive Romance language semester in Florence, and so on. Of course, in such foreign academic programs, language preparation plays a significant part.

A letter from Dr. Martin says, "Naturally there are discussions from time to time about careful coordination of retrenchment in the teaching of foreign languages, but I doubt very much if we will ever move in that direction."¹⁰

One consortium which has retained its interest in the pedagogical aspects of language study is the Latin American Studies Association, a consortium of 97 member institutions, with headquarters at the University of Florida at Gainesville. Known as LASA, this group dates from 1968, that grand era of grants and free-flowing financial aid to institutions. One of its arms, the Commission on Latin American Studies Programs, functions as the Association's area studies committee. Its current director, in answer to questions about the effectiveness and impact of the program, replies candidly that it is impossible to measure the effect of the consortium on language instruction. But, "at the very least, CLASP institutions have kept language and area studies alive on their own campuses. In recent years, it sponsored the first National Seminar on the Teaching of Latin American Studies held at the University of New Mexico."¹¹

It can be seen that consortial activities which do involve, if not the teaching then at least the use, of foreign languages are those which go beyond the mere acquisition of the language itself, and allow for implementation in other areas of potential student interest.

I'd like to call your attention to a new cooperative effort being undertaken in upper-level foreign language courses. At the University Center at Harrisburg (UCH), comprising five Pennsylvania institutions, they are specifically encouraging cross registration in advanced level language studies. Current enrollments

range around 1,200 per semester, and there are two summer school sessions each summer. This is the only consortium which indicates a special effort to use the cooperative approach to spur enrollment within the advanced courses themselves.

Bilingual language training is a subject frequently discussed and is in an area of current active development, in Louisiana in French (at all levels of instruction), in New York, Florida, Illinois, California, and Texas (in Spanish). It seems to offer a field for much greater cooperative effort among institutions than has been evinced in other areas. Funds have been obtained under Title III through the United Colleges of San Antonio for programs in bilingual education, but no other consortium indicates that this is an area of major activity.

I hope some of you have read, or will read, the excellent article which appeared in the Journal of the ADFL (Association of Departments of Foreign Languages) by Miriam De Costa, Head of the Department of Romance Languages at Howard University.¹² Entitled "Consortia Arrangements: the Benefits to a Department of Foreign Languages," Ms. De Costa's lucid presentation of several programs undertaken by consortial arrangements go to the heart of the matter. She cites, for example, the cooperation of five reasonably close institutions which formed a Joint Graduate Consortium whose central office has assured smooth, successful cooperation in offering language courses and through its Washington office, an up-to-date pipeline on legislation, foundation grants, and government funds available to D. C. universities.

A second undertaking, the Committee on Latin American Studies, has proven particularly successful in that its committee members represent such diverse and non-competitive disciplines as history, Romance Languages, Latin American studies, and political science. This unusual degree of interdisciplinary cooperation and broad perspective assured a continuity and permanence to the programs' work not previously achieved by language departments working alone in similar undertakings. What we will see more clearly, when we discuss the matter of funding, is that there needs to be added to the "mix" of the cooperative program, other areas of academic interest, to give an objective in study beyond the acquisition of language skills themselves.

This same consortium, under the leadership of Howard's language department, allowed each of its five members to write separate proposals to the National Endowment for the Humanities, in which each participating institution submitted its own project. The five projects were all funded by NEH as "The Development and Coordinating of a Latin American Studies Program." Copies of this article are available from ADFL, and several are available here for your examination. A "Caribbean Symposium" of interdisciplinary formation was also undertaken by this energetic group, and another major accomplishment was the acquisition of a visiting scholar from Colombia, through the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars, who gave an interdisciplinary course, "The Black Presence in South America."

Professor De Costa's article reminds its readers, however, that a departmental budget cannot normally underwrite such ambitious and far-reaching programs. It brings to our attention that the question of funding, beyond even the means of the consortium (whose financial resources are normally expended in the implementation of the consortium's day-to-day activities) is a primary consideration in planning and executing a proposal.

In response to my inquiries to the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, I recently received information which I can see in some ways encouraging in the sense that HEW, through Title VI and the National Defense Education Act, is funding a triple program, representing awards for study in foreign countries, under the headings, "Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Programs," "Undergraduate Level International Studies Programs," and "Graduate Level International Studies Programs." It is important to note, however, that although they sound like important language programs, and in some ways they are, the awards are frequently administered through other disciplines. The UNC-Chapel Hill Latin American award, for example, is handled through the Political Science Department for use in Latin American as part of "international studies" programs.

More than 80 grants have been made which involve the creation of International Studies Centers, of which ten include consortia arrangements. Usually consortium grants are larger than those to individual institutions to allow for additional expenses. All such Centers are required to engage in outreach activities and to share some portion of their resources with other institutions on all levels in their areas. Single institution programs are funded for periods of up to two years; consortium proposals, when approved, are funded for three-year periods. The grants are substantial, and range from a low of \$81,000 to a high of \$348,000 for the two/three year period, with a total of \$15,147,620 funding provided. Guidelines, rules and regulations can be found in the Federal Register of May 23, 1977.

The term "area studies" which achieved some degree of prominence in the 1960s has now been replaced by the HEW appellation "International Studies Centers." In making an analysis of what kinds of languages, however, the new NDEA programs are supporting, let me briefly note that of the total of 80 such centers, 18 are in East Asian languages, 14 in Slavic and East European, 10 in Latin American, 8 each in African, Middle Eastern, and South Asian studies, 4 in Near East studies, and the remaining single ones in Canadian, Western European, Mediterranean, Inner Asian, and Pacific Islands studies. This may be of interest to instructors in foreign languages on the high school level as well, where Western European languages remain the basic language offerings.

Not everyone may know that the Office of Education also administers under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act, advanced language programs overseas in study centers at Cairo, Leningrad, Taipei, and Tokyo. Grants for these programs

have been awarded to the University of Michigan, the Council for International Education and Stanford University, each of which represents a consortium of universities. It is important to keep in mind that OED says, "...it is our policy to assist individual institutions and especially consortia in carrying out these activities."

It is evident that in the very nature of such international studies centers support for the basic teaching of languages in themselves is not what is receiving the attention of funding agencies. The interdisciplinary and advanced level of study provided for in such programs reflects a true internationalization of the federal focus on fields of study which require only the foundation of a fluent language skill.

There is continuing interest on the part of foundations--such as the Lilly, Spencer, Hill, Ford, Danforth, S&H, and Kellogg Foundations, among many others--in the concentration of academic activity in consortial arrangements. The Carnegie Corporation wrote this past month that it, too, had just made a substantial grant to the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, but the objective of that grant is to determine the extent of cost-savings through consortia.¹³

It must be kept in mind, too, that external funding agencies seldom support a continuing program indefinitely. Their money is generally seed-funding to stimulate the development of new programs in anticipation that the cost of the programs will be absorbed by the participating institutions in one to five years.

The consortium as an educational institutional arrangement is a fact of life. A splendid bibliography, published by Fritz H. Grupe this summer, has over 500 entries of literature in all forms--books, articles, papers, journals, and, yes, nearly 100 dissertations which are in progress in the field of consortial study. A copy of that bibliography is available for examination and can be purchased for \$4.00 from CIL.¹⁵

The mounting evidence of interest and activity in this form of collaboration tells us that there is a way for language teaching to go beyond the survival measures of individual courses on individual campuses. Languages in themselves are no longer to be seen in the future as the end product of teaching. Their application, vocationally or professionally, must have a clearer and further goal. It will be through articulation of such goals that broader arrangements can be made institutionally, organized and funded so that languages are drawn along with them as key elements of the programs.

As part of my research for this paper, I had a computer search done through ERIC, in Washington, D. C. (the Center for Applied Linguistics) to determine where, in postsecondary education, collaborative undertakings of a consortial nature in the field of foreign languages were present. Although the search provided for up to 100 citations for further study, the sophisticated computer search turned up only 9 citations, of which three were of use or interest.

What does this tell us about the role of foreign language training in the current movement of educational trends? Does it suggest a conservatism--a holding on to the past--that we might do well to reconsider in the light of changing international conditions, teaching opportunities in the future, exhaustion of literary or esoteric research materials from constant pressure to publish, and above all, a continually declining enrollment among majors in the fields of language specialties.

Can we count forever on an assured place for the scholar who specializes in troubadour poetry in now-extinct Provençal? Or guarantee an audience for the specialist who presents a paper on the use of the Ablative in Old French texts? When the last paper has been written on the *comedia del siglo de oro*, will that represent the direction of interests of the student who wants to major in Spanish, or even develop a fluency in Spanish for other professional use?

Faced as we are with the societal, sociological, economic and government pressures toward career preparation, is it not the time to start re-thinking our complete approach to the preparation of the foreign language training programs offered on all levels? Is the medievalist, or the Renaissance expert really the wave of the future when forces outside the walls of the university are insisting on individuals prepared in various disciplines (world health affairs, political science, nursing, business, law, etc.) who speak the language of their discipline and can work comfortably with it. Can we further ignore sociological or anthropological points of view of the people themselves?

In this morning's section of the program, Professor Monique Bras has presented a beginning answer to some of these questions by formulating and implementing an innovative program of language training. It starts with the culture of the country, and moves directly into preparing students on an individual basis, for language expertise within the field of their study choice. A striking part of her program is that the student proceeds at his own pace of absorption of materials presented especially for him. Why would a similar program not be an appropriate module for development by a group of institutions, putting aside the traditional curriculum, or perhaps offering it as an alternative to existing conventional formats? Her program is eminently adaptable to high school or college teaching--even though her original proposal dealt with undergraduates aiming toward graduate degrees in a particular profession.

It is my belief that the consortium, or a comparable cooperative venture, can lie in the future at the heart of a changing perception of ourselves as language teachers. How are we best going to exploit the resources at our disposition and end the threatened "autonomous" mind set that has shackled the profession of language teaching in its response to new demands and pressures.

The publication of the Council of International Leadership, The Acquainter,¹⁶ lists numerous areas of potential research in the field of consortial activity which remains to be done. I would like to suggest that a study be made of approaches to language teaching as part of international programs where the major discipline (which would not necessarily be that of languages) could be shared among the faculties and campuses of a group of institutions. The preparation of modules for such multi-institutional use would be a most helpful tool in view of the new and revived interest on the part of major federal funding agencies which require the language as a fundamental part of the international program, but always in a supporting role.

Given the possibilities offered by a consortium, and the potential available to language curricula, it has been said that the blueprint has been drawn for a cathedral, but we have only come up with a tool shed.

I seem to return, unintentionally, to the underlying themes of the speaker last evening, Mr. Bostein, of Sandra Savignon this morning, or Monique Bras who spoke this morning as well. All agreed, from slightly different perspectives, that we need to re-think what we are teaching students, what we are teaching them for. I now suggest that we re-think how we approach that teaching, in that we should consider other forms than the traditional single-institution format and develop more flexible objectives and techniques through combined institutional effort. In the words of the Chinese proverb: "If we don't watch where we're going, we'll wind up where we're headed."

NOTES

1. B. Swenkmeier and M. E. Goodman, Putting Cooperation to Work (New York, 1972).
2. Lewis D. Patterson, Consortium Directory Update 1976 (Washington, D. C., 1976), p. v.
3. Donald A. Johnson, "The Influence of Consortia in Reshaping Higher Education," in Reshaping American Higher Education, ed. Louis C. Vaccaro and Associates (Irving, Texas, 1975), p. 44.
4. Report of Independent Higher Education in Indiana, ed. William W. Jellema (Indianapolis, 1975), p. 1.
5. Robert M. O'Neil, "Starting a Consortium: A Case Study," in Institutional Interface (Washington, 1975), p. 6.

6. Lawrence Belle, "Consortia Should Not Be Confused with Rose Gardens," in Higher Education Consortia: Idea of the Past or Wave of the Future? Report of the Danforth Foundation (St. Louis, 1972), p. 9.

7. Richard Witter, "Two Year Colleges Reach Out," in Trends and Issues in Cooperation, pp. 23-26.

8. Information in a letter to the author from Dr. Mary H. Ellis, of New Orleans Consortium, August 11, 1977 and August 25, 1977.

9. Annual Report and Handbook of Greensboro Regional Consortium, ed. William J. Lanier (Greensboro, N.C., 1975).

10. Information in a letter to the author from Dan W. Martin, President, Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Chicago, August 4, 1977.

11. Information in a letter from Felicity M. Trueblood, Latin American Studies Association, University of Florida, Gainesville, August 24, 1977.

12. Miriam DeCosta, "Consortia Arrangements: The Benefits to a Department of Foreign Languages," ADFL Journal, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 36-38.

13. Information in a letter to the author from Karin Egan, Program Assistant, Carnegie Corporation of New York, August 12, 1977.